hh

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,131	02/13/2002	Germano Caronni	06502.0356	5459

22852	7590	10/05/2005	

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/073,131	CARONNI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cam Y T. Truong	2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 June 2005*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-22,24-32 and 34-42* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-22,24-32 and 34-42* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 7, 10-12, 14-19, 22, 25, 28, 29, 32, 35, and

38-42 in the amendment filed on 6/16/2005.

Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-32, 34-42 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-32, 34-42 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argued that Bauer does not teach the claimed limitation "expanding the

expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the requesting node, wherein the

requesting node comprise a process".

Bauer teaches the claimed limitations:

"expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node" as

expanding the pathname-home/jqp/ by a value such as Meeting.age or Meeting Agenda

corresponding the user's computer (figs. 3&7-8, col. 10, lines 1-20; col. 8, lines 64-67;

col. 9, lines 1-3);

"wherein the requesting node comprise a process" as a server receiving a user's

request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The

above information shows that the client computer has included a process for sending

the user's request to the server (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, specifically, as directed to an abstract idea.

As regarding claim 39:

Claim 39 states, "a computer-readable memory device encoded with a data structure for use by an operating system in accessing file system", the claim fails to contain a computer that can be used to implement the computer-readable memory device so as to realize its functionality. Thus, claim 39 is merely abstract idea, and nonfunctional data description.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bauer (USP 5627996).

As to claim 39, Bauer teaches the claimed limitations:

"a first entry comprising an entity name extended by an uncommon string of

characters including an expandable sequence" as file entry 803 contain file name =

meeting agenda that is extended by directory 800. This directory consists a pathname-

home/jqp/metting agenda. The pathname is represented as an expandable sequence to

contain meeting agenda (fig. 3&8, col. 10, lines 1-20);

"and a second entry comprising the entity name extended by an uncommon

string of characters including a value representative of a context of a node, wherein the

node comprises a process" as file entry 805 contain file name = Childhoo.adv that is

extended by directory 800. This directory consists a pathname-home/jqp/childhoo.adv.

The pathname is represented as an expandable sequence to contain childhoo.adv (fig.

3&8, col. 10, lines 1-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11, 12, 15-22, 24-26, 29-32, 34-36, 40-43 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer (USP 5627996) in view of Kyne et al

(or hereinafter "Kyne") (US 6615237).

As to claim 1, teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving a request from a requesting node to access a file system entity having

an entity name" as receiving a user's request from the client computer to access file

system having a list of file names. The client computer is represented as a node (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-50);

"searching for an alternate entry corresponding to the file system entity" as the program determines whether the base name matches the computed alternate file for the file name 811 of the first entry 801 in the directory 800. If it is not, the system searches the next entry in the directory 800. The next entry is represented as an alternate entry (fig. 8, col. 10, lines 1-20);

"alternate entry comprising the entity name extended by an expandable sequence" as file entry 803 contain file name = meeting agenda that is extended by directory 800. This directory consists a pathname-home/jqp/metting agenda. The pathname is represented as an expandable sequence to contain meeting agenda (fig. 3&8, col. 10, lines 1-20).

"expanding the expandable sequence by a value corresponding to the node" as expanding the pathname-home/jqp/ by a value such as Meeting.age or Meeting Agenda corresponding the user's computer (figs. 3&7-8, col. 10, lines 1-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 9, lines 1-3);

"wherein the requesting node comprise a process" as a server receiving a user's request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The above information shows that the client computer has included a process for sending the user's request to the server (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-67).

Bauer does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "retrieving information corresponding to the expanded sequence" as retrieving a web page corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence (fig. 7, col. 9, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kyne's teaching of as retrieving a web page corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence to Bauer's system in order to reduce the number of times a data entry is accessed in response to a single request to a user or a node and to provide identification information that is stored in a data store entry related to a user.

As to claims 2, 20 and 30, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the retrieved information includes a location of the file system entity" as before the system retrieves an entity file in the directory, the system has to retrieve the location of the file first (figs. 6-8).

As to claims 3, 21 and 31, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the retrieved information comprises an information node" as a file entry contains an information node. Thus, when retrieving a file entry, the system retrieves an information node (col. 6, lines 20-50).

As to claim 4, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "looking up the information in a system view table using the expanded sequence; and returning the information to the node" as (fig. 8, col. 6, lines 20-40).

As to claims 6, 24 and 34, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the file system entity is at least one of a file and a folder" as (col. 10, lines 35-40).

As to claims 7, 25 and 35, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in "wherein the value is representative of a context of the node" as as expanding the pathname-home/jqp/ by a value such as Meeting.age or Meeting Agenda corresponding the user's computer (figs. 3&7-8, col. 10, lines 1-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 9, lines 1-3);

As to claims 8, 26 and 36, Bauer and Kyne teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Kyne further teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the context is one of user identification, network interface, and time of day" as network interface (fig. 4).

As to claim 11, Bauer teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving a request from a node to access a file system entity having an entity name" as receiving a user's request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The client computer is represented as a node (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-50);

"determining whether a file system view table has a first entry corresponding to

the file system entity" as the program determines whether the base name matches the

computed alternate file for the file name 811 of the first entry 801 in the directory 800. If

it is not, the system search the next entry in the directory 800. The next entry is

represented as an alternate entry (fig. 8, col. 10, lines 1-20);

"searching the file system view table for an alternate entry based on the

determination" as If it is not, the system search the next entry in the directory 800. The

next entry is represented as an alternate entry (fig. 8, col. 10, lines 1-20);

" the alternate entry comprising the entity name extended by an uncommon string

of characters including an expandable sequence" as file entry 803 contain file name =

meeting agenda that is extended by directory 800. This directory consists a pathname-

home/jqp/metting agenda. The pathname is represented as an expandable sequence to

contain meeting agenda (fig. 3&8, col. 10, lines 1-20);

"expanding the expandable sequence of the alternate entry by a value

corresponding to the node" as expanding the pathname-home/jqp/ by a value such as

Meeting.age or Meeting Agenda corresponding the user's computer (figs. 3&7-8, col.

10, lines 1-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 9, lines 1-3);

"wherein the requesting node comprise a process" as a server receiving a user's

request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The

above information shows that the client computer has included a process for sending

the user's request to the server (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-67).

Bauer does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "retrieving information corresponding to the expanded alternate entry" as retrieving a web page corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence (fig. 7, col. 9, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kyne's teaching of as retrieving a web page corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence to Bauer's system in order to reduce the number of times a data entry is accessed in response to a single request to a user or a node and to provide identification information that is stored in a data store entry related to a user.

As to claim 12, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "looking up the information in the file system view table using the expanded alternate entry; and returning the information to the node" as (col. 6, lines 15-50).

As to claim 15, Bauer and Kyne disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 12, Kyne further teaches the claimed limitation "sending the information to the node based on a determination that the node is permitted access to the information; and sending an error indication to the node based on a determination that the node is not permitted access to the information" as

As to claim 16, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "sending an error indication to the node based on a determination that the file system view table is missing the alternate entry" as (fig. 5)

As to claim 17, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "sending an error indication to the node based on a determination that the file system view table is missing the information corresponding to the expanded alternate entry" as (fig. 5).

As to claim 18, Bauer teaches the claimed limitations:

"a memory including an operating system that: receives a request from a node to access a file system entity having an entity name" as server computer can support one or more large hard disks that can be made available to client PCs that has an UNIX operating system. This system receives a user's request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The client computer is represented as a node (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-50);

"searches for an alternate entry corresponding to the file system entity" as the program determines whether the base name matches the computed alternate file for the file name 811 of the first entry 801 in the directory 800. If it is not, the system searches the next entry in the directory 800. The next entry is represented as an alternate entry (fig. 8, col. 10, lines 1-20);

"the alternate entry comprising the entity name extended by an uncommon string of characters including an expandable sequence" as file entry 803 contain file name =

meeting agenda that is extended by directory 800. This directory consists a pathname-

home/jqp/metting agenda. The pathname is represented as an expandable sequence to

contain meeting agenda (fig. 3&8, col. 10, lines 1-20);

"and a processor that runs the operating system" as (col. 3, lines 25-35).

"expanding the expandable sequence of the alternate entry by a value

corresponding to the node" as expanding the pathname-home/jqp/ by a value such as

Meeting.age or Meeting Agenda corresponding the user's computer (figs. 3&7-8, col.

10, lines 1-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 9, lines 1-3);

"wherein the requesting node comprise a process" as a server receiving a user's

request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The

above information shows that the client computer has included a process for sending

the user's request to the server (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-67).

Bauer does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "retrieving information

corresponding to the expanded alternate entry" as retrieving a web page corresponding

to a URL as the expanded sequence (fig. 7, col. 9, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Kyne's teaching of as retrieving a web page

corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence to Bauer's system in order to

reduce the number of times a data entry is accessed in response to a single request to

a user or a node and to provide identification information that is stored in a data store

entry related to a user.

As to claims 19 and 29, Bauer teaches the claimed limitations:

"means for receiving a request from a node to access a file system entity having an entity name" as server computer can support one or more large hard disks that can be made available to client PCs that has an UNIX operating system. This system receives a user's request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The client computer is represented as a node (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-50);

"means for searching for an alternate entry corresponding to the file system entity" as the program determines whether the base name matches the computed alternate file for the file name 811 of the first entry 801 in the directory 800. If it is not, the system searches the next entry in the directory 800. The next entry is represented as an alternate entry (fig. 8, col. 10, lines 1-20);

"the alternate entry comprising the entity name extended by an uncommon string of characters including an expandable sequence" as file entry 803 contain file name = meeting agenda that is extended by directory 800. This directory consists a pathname-home/jqp/metting agenda. The pathname is represented as an expandable sequence to contain meeting agenda (fig. 3&8, col. 10, lines 1-20).

pathname-home/jqp/ by a value such as Meeting.age or Meeting Agenda corresponding the user's computer (figs. 3&7-8, col. 10, lines 1-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 9, lines 1-3);

"wherein the requesting node comprise a process" as a server receiving a user's request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The

above information shows that the client computer has included a process for sending

the user's request to the server (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-67).

Bauer does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "retrieving information

corresponding to the expanded alternate entry" as retrieving a web page corresponding

to a URL as the expanded sequence (fig. 7, col. 9, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Kyne's teaching of as retrieving a web page

corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence to Bauer's system in order to

reduce the number of times a data entry is accessed in response to a single request to

a user or a node and to provide identification information that is stored in a data store

entry related to a user.

As to claim 22, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "means for looking up the

information in a system view table using the expanded alternate entry: and means for

returning the information to the node" as (col. 6, lines 45-50, fig. 5).

As to claim 32, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "looking up the information

in a system view table using the expanded alternate entry; and returning the information

to the node" as (fig. 4).

As to claims 40 and 41, Bauer teaches the claimed limitations:

"a secondary storage comprising a plurality of file system entities, each of the file system entities including an entity name" as hardware stores a plurality of file system entities files (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 15-45);

"a memory comprising: an operating system including: a file system view table including a plurality of entries" as (col. 5, lines 35-65);

"a lookup routine operable to receive a request from a node to access a file system entity" (col. 6, lines 30-40),

"determine whether the file system view table has a first entry corresponding to the file system entity" as (col. 6, lines 30-40);

"search the file system view table for an alternate entry based on the determination, the alternate entry comprising an entity name of the requested entity extended by an uncommon string of characters including an expandable sequence" as (col. 6, lines 15-50);

"a processor that runs the operating system" as (fig. 1).

pathname-home/jqp/ by a value such as Meeting.age or Meeting Agenda corresponding the user's computer (figs. 3&7-8, col. 10, lines 1-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 9, lines 1-3);

"wherein the requesting node comprise a process" as a server receiving a user's request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The above information shows that the client computer has included a process for sending the user's request to the server (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-67).

Bauer does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "retrieving information corresponding to the expanded alternate entry" as retrieving a web page corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence (fig. 7, col. 9, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kyne's teaching of as retrieving a web page corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence to Bauer's system in order to reduce the number of times a data entry is accessed in response to a single request to a user or a node and to provide identification information that is stored in a data store entry related to a user.

As to claim 42, Bauer teaches the claimed limitations:

"sending, from a node to a lookup routine, a request for access to a file system entity having an entity name, wherein the lookup routine performs a method comprising: searching for an alternate entry corresponding to the file system entity" as (figs. 3&8, col. 8, lines 30-50; col. 10, lines 1-20),

"the alternate entry comprising the entity name extended by an uncommon string of characters including an expandable sequence" as (col. 6, lines 15-50).

pathname-home/jqp/ by a value such as Meeting.age or Meeting Agenda corresponding the user's computer (figs. 3&7-8, col. 10, lines 1-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 9, lines 1-3);

"wherein the requesting node comprise a process" as a server receiving a user's request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The

above information shows that the client computer has included a process for sending

the user's request to the server (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-67).

Bauer does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "retrieving information

corresponding to the expanded alternate entry" as retrieving a web page corresponding

to a URL as the expanded sequence (fig. 7, col. 9, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Kyne's teaching of as retrieving a web page

corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence to Bauer's system in order to

reduce the number of times a data entry is accessed in response to a single request to

a user or a node and to provide identification information that is stored in a data store

entry related to a user.

As to claim 43, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "looking up the information

in a system view table using the expanded alternate entry in various permutations" as

(fig. 8, col. 10, lines 20-55).

8.   Claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 27, 28, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Bauer (USP 5627996) in view of shandony (USP 6675261)

and further in view of Hagersten et al (or hereinafter "Hagersten") (UPS 6308246).

As to claims 9, 13, 27 and 37, Bauer and Shandony discloses the claimed

limitation subject matter in claim 4, except the claimed limitation "looking up the

alternate entry in the file system view table based on a determination that the system view table is missing a first entry corresponding to the file system entity".

Hagersten teaches that look-up table for multiprocessor computer system, moves specified datum from primary entry to alternate entry, if both primary and secondary entries are not available for new datum (abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hagersten's teaching of look-up table for multiprocessor computer system, moves specified datum from primary entry to alternate entry, if both primary and secondary entries are not available for new datum to Bauer's system and Shandony's system in order to continue process data and retrieve information to a user without interruption.

As to claims 10, 14, 28 and 38, Bauer teaches the claimed limitation "sending information corresponding to the first entry to the node based on a determination that the file system view table has the first entry" as (col. 6, lines 30-50).

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Pinkoski (US 5742817).

Contact Information

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-272 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2162
10/1/2005